arXiv:1204.1683v1 [math.OC] 7 Apr 2012

Optimal Multi-Modes Switching with the Switching Cost not necessarily Positive

Brahim EL ASRI [*] and Imade FAKHOURI [†]

March 2, 2013

Abstract

In this paper, we study the m-states optimal switching problem in finite horizon, when the switching cost functions are arbitrary and can be positive or negative. This has an economic incentive in terms of central evaluation in cases where such organizations or state grants or financial assistance to power plants that promotes green energy in their production activity or what uses less polluting modes in their production. We show existence for optimal strategy via a verification theorem then we show existence and uniqueness of the value processes by using an approximation scheme. In the markovian framework we show that the value processes can be characterized in terms of deterministic continuous functions of the state of the process. Those latter functions are the unique viscosity solutions for a system of m variational partial differential inequalities with inter-connected obstacles.

Keywords. Real options, Backward stochastic differential equations, Snell envelope, Stopping times, Switching, Viscosity solution of PDEs, Variational inequalities

1 Introduction

In this paper we consider the optimal m-states switching problem in finite horizon when the switching costs are arbitrary and not necessarily positive which is the novelty of this paper. This has an economical motivation in terms of firms valuation.

In order to introduce the problem let us deal with an example. Assume a power plant which produces electricity and which has several modes of production, therefore it is put in the instantenuous most profitable one wich is affected by the price $(X_t)_{t\geq 0}$ of electricity in the market that fluctuates in reaction to many factors such as demand level,weather conditions, unexpected outages etc, in addition to the

---

[*] Université Cadi Ayyad, Dépt. de Mathématiques, FSTG, B.P. 549, Marrakech, 40.000, Maroc. e-mails: b.elasri@uca.ma

[†] Université Cadi Ayyad, Dépt. de Mathématiques, FSS, B.P. 2390, Marrakech, 40.000, Maroc. e-mails: imade-fakhouri@gmail.com

fact that electricity is non-storable so once produced, it should be immediately consumed. Thus the manager of the plant aims at maximizing its global profit. For this objective, she implements an optimal strategy wich is a pair of two sequences $(\tau_n)_{n\geq 1}$ and $(\epsilon_n)_{n\geq 1}$describing respectively the optimal successive switching times and modes. When the plant is in mode $i \in \mathcal{I}$, it provides a profit $\psi_i(t, X_t)dt$ wich depends on that mode. However this gain also incorporates a switching cost $g_{ij}(t, X_t)$, that could be positive or negative, when switching the plant from the mode i to another one. This means that when $g_{ij}(t, X_t) > 0$, then switching is not free and generates expenditures, other hand when $g_{ij}(t, X_t) \leq 0$, it is the case when the state and environmental organizations, providing grants and financial aid to power plants that use energy green in their production activities or methods of cleaner production, which émettentt less carbon into the air.

The switching from one regime to another one is realized sequentially at random times which are part of the decisions. So the manager of the power plant faces two main issues:

(i) when should she decide to switch the production from its current mode to another one?

(ii) to which mode the production has to be switched when the decision of switching is made?

Optimal switching problems were studied by several authors (see e.g. [1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 24, 29, 32] and the references therein). The motivations are mainly related to decision making in the economic sphere. In order to tackle those problems, authors use mainly two approaches. Either a probabilistic one [11, 12, 20] or an approach which uses partial differential inequalities (PDIs for short) [3, 6, 14, 17, 32, 29].

In the finite horizon framework Djehiche *et al.* [12] have studied the multi-modes switching problem when the profit and the switching costs only depend on t ,by using probabilistic tools. They have proved existence of a solution and found an optimal strategy when the switching costs from state i to state j is strictly non-negative $(g_{ij}(t) > \alpha > 0)$. The partial differential equation approach of this work has been carried out by El Asri and Hamadène [17] when $g_{ij}(t, X_t) > \alpha > 0$. They showed that when the price process $(X_t : t \geq 0)$ is solution of a Markovian stochastic differential equation, then this problem is associated to a system of variational inequalities with interconnected obstacles for which we provided a solution in viscosity sense. This solution turns out to be the value function of the problem. Moreover the solution of the system is unique. In the same spirit El Asri [16] studied the problem when $g_{ij}(t, X_t) \geq 0$, we showed the existence of the optimal strategy and uniqueness of the solution in viscosity sense of the problem.

The purpose of this work is to fill in this gap by providing a solution to the optimal multiple switching problem when the switching costs could be positive or negative, using probabilistic tools as the Snell envelope of processes, backward stochastic differential equations (BSDEs for short), and partial differential equation approach.

We prove existence and uniqueness of the vector of value functions and provide a characterization of an optimal strategy of this problem when the payoff rates ψ_i and the switching costs g_{ij} (positive or negative) are adapted only to the filtration generated by a Brownian motion. Later on, in the markovian framework, we show that the value function of the problem is associated to an uplet of deterministic functions $(v^1, \dots, v^m)$ which is the unique solution of the following system of PDIs:

$$\begin{cases} \min\left\{v_i(t,x) - \max\limits_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}\{-g_{ij}(t,x)+v_j(t,x)\}, -\partial_t v_i(t,x) - \mathcal{A}v_i(t,x) - \psi_i(t,x)\right\} = 0 \\ \forall\ (t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbf{R}^k,\ i\in\mathcal{I}=\{1,...,m\}, \text{ and } \ v_i(T,x)=0, \end{cases} \tag{1.1}$$

where $\mathcal{A}$ an operator associated with a diffusion process and $\mathcal{I}^{-i} := \mathcal{I}\setminus\{i\}$. It turns out that this system is the deterministic version of the Verification Theorem of the optimal multi-modes switching problem in finite horizon.

This paper is organized as follows:

In Section 2, we formulate the problem and give the related definitions. In Section 3, we shall introduce the optimal switching problem under consideration and give its probabilistic Verification Theorem. It is expressed by means of the Snell envelope of processes. Then we introduce the approximating scheme which enables us to construct a solution for the Verification Theorem. Section 4 is devoted to the connection between the optimal switching problem, the Verification Theorem and the associated system of PDIs. This connection is made through BSDEs with one reflecting obstacle in the Markovian case. Further we show existence and continuity of a solution for the system of PDIs. Finally, in Section 5, we show that the solution of PDIs is unique in the class of continuous functions which satisfy a polynomial growth condition.

2 Formulation of the problem and assumptions

2.1 Setting of the problem

The finite horizon multiple switching problem can be formulated as follows. Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the set of all possible activity modes of the production of a power plant. A management strategy of the plant consists, on the one hand, of the choice of a sequence of nondecreasing stopping times $(\tau_n)_{n\geq 1}$ (i.e. $\tau_n \leq \tau_{n+1}$, $\tau_0 = 0$ and $\tau_n \to T$ when $n \to +\infty$) where the manager decides to switch the activity from its current mode to another one. On the other hand, it consists of the choice of the mode ξ_n, which is an $\mathcal{F}_{\tau_n}$-measurable random variable taking values in $\mathcal{I}$, to which the production is switched at τ_n from its current mode. Therefore the admissible management strategies of the plant are the pairs $(\delta, \xi) := ((\tau_n)_{n\geq 1}, (\xi_n)_{n\geq 1})$ and the set of these strategies is denoted by $\mathcal{D}$.

Let $X := (X_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ be an $\mathcal{P}$-measurable, $\mathbf{R}^k$-valued continuous stochastic process which stands for the market price of k factors which determine the market price of the commodity. Assuming that the production activity is in mode 1 at the initial time $t = 0$, let $(u_t)_{t\leq T}$ denote the indicator of the production activity's mode at time $t \in [0,T]$:

$$u_t = \mathbf{1}_{[0,\tau_1]}(t) + \sum_{n\geq 1} \xi_n \mathbf{1}_{(\tau_n,\tau_{n+1}]}(t). \tag{2.1}$$

Then for any $t \leq T$, the state of the whole economic system related to the project at time t is represented by the vector

$$(t, X_t, u_t) \in [0,T] \times \mathbf{R}^k \times \mathcal{I}. \tag{2.2}$$

Finally, let $\psi_i(t, X_t)$ be the instantaneous profit when the system is in state (t, X_t, i), and for $i, j \in \mathcal{I}$ $i \neq j$, let $g_{ij}(t, X_t)$ denote the switching cost of the production at time t from current mode i to another mode j. Then if the plant is run under the strategy $(\delta, \xi) = ((\tau_n)_{n\geq 1}, (\xi_n)_{n\geq 1})$ the expected total profit is given by:

$$J(\delta,\xi) = E\left[\int_0^T \psi_{u_s}(s, X_s)ds - \sum_{n\geq 1} g_{u_{\tau_{n-1}} u_{\tau_n}}(\tau_n, X_{\tau_n})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_n<T]}\right].$$

Therefore the problem we are interested in is to find an optimal strategy *i.e.* a strategy (δ^*, ξ^*) such that $J(\delta^*, \xi^*) \geq J(\delta, \xi)$ for any $(\delta, \xi) \in \mathcal{D}$.

We now consider the following system of m variational inequalities with inter-connected obstacles: $\forall\ i \in \mathcal{I}$

$$\begin{cases} \min\left\{v_i(t,x) - \max\limits_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}\{-g_{ij}(t,x) + v_j(t,x)\}, -\partial_t v_i(t,x) - \mathcal{A}v_i(t,x) - \psi_i(t,x)\right\} = 0, \\ v_i(T,x) = 0, \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

where $\mathcal{A}$ is given by:

$$\mathcal{A} = \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^m (\sigma\sigma^*)_{ij}(t,x)\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} + \sum_{i=1}^m b_i(t,x)\frac{\partial}{\partial x_i}\,; \tag{2.4}$$

hereafter the superscript $(^*)$ stands for the transpose, Tr is the trace operator and finally $\langle x, y\rangle$ is the inner product of $x, y \in \mathbf{R}^k$.

The main objective of this paper is to focus on the existence and uniqueness of the solution in viscosity sense of (2.3). This system is the deterministic version of the optimal m-states switching problem when we assume that the market price process X of the commodity is an Itô diffusion.

Recall the notion of viscosity solution of the system (2.3).

Definition 1 *Let $(v_1, \ldots, v_m)$ be a m-uplet of continuous functions defined on $[0,T] \times \mathbf{R}^k$, $\mathbf{R}$-valued and such that $v_i(T,x) = 0$ for any $x \in \mathbf{R}^k$ and $i \in \mathcal{I}$. The m-uplet $(v_1, \ldots, v_m)$ is called:*

(i) a viscosity supersolution (resp. subsolution) of the system if for each fixed $i \in \mathcal{I}$, for any $(t_0, x_0) \in [0,T] \times \mathbf{R}^k$ and any function $\varphi_i \in \mathcal{C}^{1,2}([0,T] \times \mathbf{R}^k)$ such that $\varphi_i(t_0,x_0) = v_i(t_0,x_0)$ and (t_0,x_0) is a local maximum of $\varphi_i - v_i$ (resp. minimum), we have:

$$\min\Big\{v_i(t_0,x_0) - \max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}\{-g_{ij}(t_0,x_0) + v_j(t_0,x_0)\} \\ ; -\partial_t\varphi_i(t_0,x_0) - \mathcal{A}\varphi_i(t_0,x_0) - \psi_i(t_0,x_0)\} \geq 0 \ (\textit{resp.} \leq 0). \tag{2.5}$$

(ii) *a viscosity solution if it is both a viscosity supersolution and subsolution.* $\square$

There is an equivalent formulation of this definition (see e.g.[7]) which we give because it will be useful later. So firstly we define the notions of superjet and subjet of a continuous function v.

Definition 2 *Let $v \in \mathcal{C}((0,T)\times \mathbf{R}^k)$, (t,x) an element of $(0,T)\times\mathbf{R}^k$ and finally $\mathbf{S}_k$ the set of $k\times k$ symmetric matrices. We denote by $J^{2,+}v(t,x)$ (resp.$J^{2,-}v(t,x)$), the superjets (resp. the subjets) of v at (t,x), the set of triples $(p,q,X)\in \mathbf{R}\times\mathbf{R}^k\times\mathbf{S}_k$ such that:*

$$v(s,y) \quad\leq\quad v(t,x)+p(s-t)+\langle q,y-x\rangle+\frac{1}{2}\langle X(y-x),y-x\rangle+o(|s-t|+|y-x|^2)$$

$$(resp. v(s,y) \quad\geq\quad v(t,x)+p(s-t)+\langle q,y-x\rangle+\frac{1}{2}\langle X(y-x),y-x\rangle+o(|s-t|+|y-x|^2)).$$

Note that if $\varphi - v$ has a local maximum (resp. minimum) at (t,x), then we obviously have:

$$\big(D_t\varphi(t,x),D_x\varphi(t,x),D^2_{xx}\varphi(t,x)\big)\in J^{2,-}v(t,x)\ \ (\text{resp.}J^{2,+}v(t,x)).\square$$

We now give an equivalent definition of a viscosity solution of the parabolic system with interconnected obstacles.

Definition 3 *Let $(v_1,\ldots,v_m)$ be a m-uplet of continuous functions defined on $[0,T]\times\mathbf{R}^k$, $\mathbf{R}$-valued and such that $(v_1,\ldots,v_m)(T,x)=0$ for any $x\in\mathbf{R}^k$. The m-uplet $(v_1,\ldots,v_m)$ is called a viscosity supersolution (resp. subsolution) of if for any $i\in\mathcal{I}$, $(t,x)\in(0,T)\times\mathbf{R}^k$ and $(p,q,X)\in J^{2,-}v_i(t,x)$ (resp. $J^{2,+}v_i(t,x)$),*

$$min\left\{v_i(t,x)-\max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ij}(t,x)+v_j(t,x)),-p-\frac{1}{2}Tr[\sigma^*X\sigma]-\langle b,q\rangle-\psi_i(t,x)\right\}\geq 0$$
$$(resp. \leq 0).$$

It is called a viscosity solution it is both a viscosity subsolution and supersolution. $\square$

2.2 Assumption

Throughout this paper T (resp. k, d) is a fixed real (resp.integers) positive numbers. Let $(\Omega,\mathcal{F},P)$ be a fixed probability space on which is defined a standard d-dimensional Brownian motion $B=(B_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ whose natural filtration is $(\mathcal{F}^0_t:=\sigma\{B_s,s\leq t\})_{0\leq t\leq T}$. Let $\mathbf{F}=(\mathcal{F}_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ be the completed filtration of $(\mathcal{F}^0_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ with the P-null sets of $\mathcal{F}$.

Furthermore, let:

- $\mathcal{P}$ be the σ-algebra on $[0,T]\times\Omega$ of $\mathbf{F}$-progressively measurable sets;

- $\mathcal{M}^{2,k}$ be the set of $\mathcal{P}$-measurable and $\mathbf{R}^k$-valued processes $w = (w_t)_{t \leq T}$ such that $E[\int_0^T |w_s|^2 ds] < +\infty$ and $\mathcal{S}^2$ be the set of $\mathcal{P}$-measurable,continuous processes $w = (w_t)_{t \leq T}$ such that $E[\sup_{t \leq T} |w_t|^2] < \infty$;

- for any stopping time $\tau \in [0, T]$, $\mathcal{T}_\tau$ denotes the set of all stopping times θ such that $\tau \leq \theta \leq T$.

We now make the following assumptions on the data:
(i) $b : [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^k \to \mathbf{R}^k$ and $\sigma : [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^k \to \mathbf{R}^{k \times d}$ be two continuous functions for which there exists a constant $C > 0$ such that for any $t \in [0, T]$ and $x, x' \in \mathbf{R}^k$

$$|\sigma(t, x)| + |b(t, x)| \leq C(1 + |x|) \quad \text{and}$$

$$|\sigma(t, x) - \sigma(t, x')| + |b(t, x) - b(t, x')| \leq C|x - x'|. \tag{2.6}$$

(ii) For $i, j \in \mathcal{I} = \{1, \ldots, m\}$, $g_{ij} : [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^k \to \mathbf{R}$ and $\psi_i : [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^k \to \mathbf{R}$ are continuous functions and of polynomial growth, *i.e.* there exist some positive constants C and γ such that for each $i, j \in \mathcal{I}$:

$$|\psi_i(t, x)| + |g_{ij}(t, x)| \leq C(1 + |x|^\gamma), \ \forall \ (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^k. \tag{2.7}$$

(iii) The switching cost from regime i to j, g_{ij} could be negative. For any $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^k$, $g_{ij}(t, x)$ are satisfying

$$g_{ii}(t, x) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad g_{ij}(t, x) + g_{ji}(t, x) > 0, \quad j \neq i \in \mathcal{I}. \tag{2.8}$$

In another way for any $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^k$ and for any sequence of indices $i_1, \ldots, i_k$ such that $i_1 = i_k$ we have:

$$g_{i_1 i_2}(t, x) + g_{i_2 i_3}(t, x) + \ldots + g_{i_{k-1} i_k}(t, x) + g_{i_k i_1}(t, x) > 0. \tag{2.9}$$

(iv) If g_{ij} is non positive, we assume that $g_{ij}(T, X_T) = 0$.
(v) We assume that, there exists a constant $K > 0$ such that:

$$Card\{g_{ij}(t, x) < 0, j \in \mathcal{I}^{-i}, (t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^k\} \leq K. \tag{2.10}$$

This condition means that the negative switching costs are limited , because if not we would earn money by switching so we would switch regimes all the time and then the value would be infinite, which is not realistic.

3 The Verification Theorem and existence of the processes $Y^i, i = 1, \ldots, m$

Note that in order that the quantity $J(\delta, \xi)$ makes sense, we assume throughout this paper that, for any $i, j \in \mathcal{I}$ the processes $(\psi_i(t, X_t))_{t \leq T}$ and $(g_{ij}(t, X_t))_{t \leq T}$ belong to $\mathcal{M}^{2,1}$ and $\mathcal{S}^2$ respectively. There is one to one correspondence between the pairs (δ, ξ) and the pairs (δ, u). Therefore throughout this paper one refers indifferently to (δ, ξ) or (δ, u).

Definition 3.1 *The admissible management strategies are the pairs* $(\delta, \xi) = ((\tau)_{n\geq 1}, (\xi)_{n\geq 1})$ *that verify also that* $\mathbf{P}[\tau_n < T \ , \ \forall \ n \geq 0] = 0$. *This set is called of admissible strategies and denoted* $\mathcal{D}$.

3.1 The Verification Theorem

To tackle the problem described above Djehiche *et al.* [12] have introduced a Verification Theorem which is expressed by means of Snell envelope of processes. The Snell envelope of a stochastic process $(\eta_t)_{t\leq T}$ of $\mathcal{S}^2$ (with a possible positive jump at T) is the lowest supermartingale $R(\eta) := (R(\eta)_t)_{t\leq T}$ of $\mathcal{S}^2$ such that for any $t \leq T$, $R(\eta)_t \geq \eta_t$. It has the following expression:

$$\forall \ t \leq T, \ R(\eta)_t = \operatorname*{esssup}_{\tau\in\mathcal{T}_t} E[\eta_\tau|\mathcal{F}_t] \text{ and satisfies } R(\eta)_T = \eta_T.$$

For more details we refer to [5, 18].

The Verification Theorem for the m-states optimal switching problem is the following:

Theorem 3.1 *Assume that there exist* m *processes* $(Y^i := (Y^i_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}, i = 1, \ldots, m)$ *of* $\mathcal{S}^2$ *such that:*

$$\begin{aligned}\forall \ t \leq T, \qquad & Y^i_t = \operatorname*{esssup}_{\tau\geq t} E\left[\int_t^\tau \psi_i(s, X_s)ds + \max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ij}(\tau, X_\tau) + Y^j_\tau)\mathbf{1}_{[\tau<T]}|\mathcal{F}_t\right], \\ & Y^i_T = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Then:

(i) $Y^1_0 = \sup_{(\delta,\xi)\in\mathcal{D}} J(\delta, u)$.

(ii) Define the sequence of $\mathbf{F}$*-stopping times* $\delta^* = (\tau^*_n)_{n\geq 1}$ *as follows :*

$$\begin{aligned}&\tau^*_1 = \inf\left\{s \geq 0, \quad Y^1_s = \max_{j\in \ \mathcal{I}^{-1}}(-g_{1j}(s, X_s) + Y^j_s)\right\} \wedge T. \\ &\textit{For} \quad n \geq 2, \\ &\tau^*_n = \inf\left\{s \geq \tau^*_{n-1}, \quad Y_s^{u_{\tau^*_{n-1}}} = \max_{k\in\mathcal{I}\setminus\{u_{\tau^*_{n-1}}\}}(-g_{u_{\tau^*_{n-1}}k}(s, X_s) + Y^k_s)\right\} \wedge T,\end{aligned}$$

where:

- $u_{\tau^*_1} = \sum_{j\in \ \mathcal{I}} j\mathbf{1}_{\{\max_{k\in \ \mathcal{I}^{-1}}(-g_{1k}(\tau^*_1, X_{\tau^*_1}) + Y^k_{\tau^*_1}) = -g_{1j}(\tau^*_1, X_{\tau^*_1}) + Y^j_{\tau^*_1}\}}$;
- *for any* $n \geq 1$ *and* $t \geq \tau^*_n$, $Y_t^{u_{\tau^*_n}} = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}} \mathbf{1}_{[u_{\tau^*_n}=j]} Y^j_t$

- *for any* $n \geq 2$*,* $u_{\tau_n^*} = l$ *on the set*

$$\left\{\max_{k\in\mathcal{I}\setminus\{u_{\tau^*_{n-1}}\}}(-g_{u_{\tau^*_{n-1}}k}(\tau_n^*, X_{\tau_n^*}) + Y^k_{\tau_n^*}) = -g_{u_{\tau^*_{n-1}}l}(\tau_n^*, X_{\tau_n^*}) + Y^l_{\tau_n^*}\right\}$$

with $g_{u_{\tau^*_{n-1}}k}(\tau_n^*, X_{\tau_n^*}) = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}} \mathbf{1}_{[u_{\tau^*_{n-1}}=j]} g_{jk}(\tau_n^*, X_{\tau_n^*})$ *and* $\mathcal{I}\setminus\{u_{\tau^*_{n-1}}\} = \sum_{j\in\mathcal{I}} \mathbf{1}_{[u_{\tau^*_{n-1}}=j]}\mathcal{I}^{-j}$*.*
Then the strategy (δ^*, u^*) *is optimal and admissible and satisfies:*

$$-\infty < E\left[\sum_{k\geq 1} g_{u_{\tau^*_{k-1}}u_{\tau^*_k}}(\tau^*_k, X_{\tau^*_k})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau^*_k<T]}\right] < +\infty.$$

Proof. The proof is divided in three steps

Step 1.(i) It consists in showing that for any $t \leq T$, Y_t^i, as defined by is the expected total profit or the value function of the optimal problem, given that the system is in mode i at time t. More precisely,

$$Y_t^i = \operatorname*{esssup}_{(\delta,u)\in\mathcal{D}_t} E\left[\int_t^T \psi_i(s, X_s)ds - \sum_{k\geq 1} g_{u_{\tau_{k-1}}u_{\tau_k}}(\tau_k, X_{\tau_k})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_k<T]}|\mathcal{F}_t\right],$$

where $\mathcal{D}_t$ is the set of strategies such that $\tau_1 \geq t$, P-a.s. if at time t the system is in the mode i.
From properties of the Snell envelope and at time $t = 0$ the system is in mode 1, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_0^1 &= E\left[\int_0^{\tau_1^*} \psi_1(s, X_s)ds + \max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-1}}(-g_{1j}(\tau_1^*, X_{\tau_1^*}) + Y^j_{\tau_1^*})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_1^*<T]}\right] \\ &= E\left[\int_0^{\tau_1^*} \psi_1(s, X_s)ds + (-g_{1u_{\tau_1^*}}(\tau_1^*, X_{\tau_1^*}) + Y^{u_{\tau_1^*}}_{\tau_1^*})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_1^*<T]}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Next we are going to need the following lemma:

Lemma 3.1 *For every* $\tau_1^* \leq t \leq T$*.*

$$Y_t^{u_{\tau_1^*}} = \operatorname*{esssup}_{\tau\geq t} E\left[\int_t^\tau \psi_{u_{\tau_1^*}}(s, X_s)ds + \max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-u_{\tau_1^*}}}(-g_{u_{\tau_1^*}j}(\tau, X_\tau) + Y^j_\tau)\mathbf{1}_{[\tau<T]}|\mathcal{F}_t\right]. \square \qquad (3.2)$$

Proof of Lemma . From we have for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $0 \leq t \leq T$

$$Y_t^i = \operatorname*{esssup}_{\tau\geq t} E\left[\int_t^\tau \psi_i(s, X_s)ds + \max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ij}(\tau, X_\tau) + Y^j_\tau)\mathbf{1}_{[\tau<T]}|\mathcal{F}_t\right]. \qquad (3.3)$$

This also means that the process $(Y_t^i + \int_0^t \psi_i(s, X_s)ds)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ is a supermartingale which dominates

$$\left(\int_0^t \psi_i(s, X_s)ds + \max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ij}(t, X_t) + Y^j_t)\mathbf{1}_{[t<T]}\right)_{0\leq t\leq T}.$$

This implies that the process $(\mathbf{1}_{[u_{\tau_1^*}=i]}(Y_t^i + \int_{\tau_1^*}^t \psi_i(s, X_s)ds))_{t\geq\tau_1^*}$ is a supermartingale which dominates

$$\left(\mathbf{1}_{[u_{\tau_1^*}=i]}(\int_{\tau_1^*}^t \psi_i(s, X_s)ds + \max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ij}(s, X_t) + Y^j_t)\mathbf{1}_{[t<T]})\right)_{t\geq\tau_1^*}.$$

Since $\mathcal{I}$ is finite, the process $(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\mathbf{1}_{[u_{\tau_1^*}=i]}(Y_t^i+\int_{\tau_1^*}^t\psi_i(s,X_s)ds))_{t\geq\tau_1^*}$ is also a supermartingale which dominates

$$\left(\sum_{i\in\mathcal{I}}\mathbf{1}_{[u_{\tau_1^*}=i]}(\int_{\tau_1^*}^t\psi_i(s,X_s)ds+\max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ij}(t,X_t)+Y_t^j)\mathbf{1}_{[t<T]})\right)_{t\geq\tau_1^*}.$$

Thus, the process $Y_t^{u_{\tau_1^*}}+\int_{\tau_1^*}^t\psi_{u_{\tau_1^*}}(s,X_s)ds)_{t\geq\tau_1^*}$ is a supermartingale which is greater than

$$\left(\int_{\tau_1^*}^t\psi_{u_{\tau_1^*}}(s,X_s)ds+\max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-u_{\tau_1^*}}}(-g_{u_{\tau_1^*}j}(t,X_t)+Y_t^j)\mathbf{1}_{[t<T]}\right)_{t\geq\tau_1^*}.$$

To complete the proof it remains to show that it is the smallest one which has this property and use the characterization of the Snell envelope see e.g. [5, 18].

Indeed, let $(Z_t)_{0\leq t\leq T}$ be a supermartingale of class $[D]$ such that, for any $\tau_1^*\leq t\leq T$,

$$Z_t\geq\int_{\tau_1^*}^t\psi_{u_{\tau_1^*}}(s,X_s)ds+\max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-u_{\tau_1^*}}}(-g_{u_{\tau_1^*}j}(t,X_t)+Y_t^j)\mathbf{1}_{[t<T]}.$$

It follows that for every $\tau_1^*\leq t\leq T$,

$$\mathbf{1}_{[u_{\tau_1^*}=i]}Z_t\geq\mathbf{1}_{[u_{\tau_1^*}=i]}\left(\int_{\tau_1^*}^t\psi_i(s,X_s)ds+\max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ij}(t,X_t)+Y_t^j)\mathbf{1}_{[t<T]}\right).$$

But, the process $(\mathbf{1}_{[u_{\tau_1^*}=i]}Z_t)_{t\geq\tau_1^*}$ is a supermartingale and for every $t\geq\tau_1^*$,

$$\mathbf{1}_{[u_{\tau_1^*}=i]}Y_t^i=\operatorname*{esssup}_{\tau\geq t}E\left[\mathbf{1}_{[u_{\tau_1^*}=i]}\left(\int_t^\tau\psi_i(s,X_s)ds+\max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ij}(\tau,X_\tau)+Y_\tau^j)\mathbf{1}_{[\tau<T]}\right)|\mathcal{F}_t\right].$$

It follows that, for every $\tau_1^*\leq t\leq T$,

$$\mathbf{1}_{[u_{\tau_1^*}=i]}Z_t\geq\mathbf{1}_{[u_{\tau_1^*}=i]}(Y_t^i+\int_{\tau_1^*}^t\psi_i(s,X_s)ds).$$

Summing over i, we get, for every $\tau_1^*\leq t\leq T$,

$$Z_t\geq Y_t^{u_{\tau_1^*}}+\int_{\tau_1^*}^t\psi_{u_{\tau_1^*}}(s,X_s)ds.$$

Hence, the process $(Y_t^{u_{\tau_1^*}}+\int_{\tau_1^*}^t\psi_{u_{\tau_1^*}}(s,X_s)ds)_{t\geq\tau_1^*}$ is the Snell envelope of

$$\left(\int_{\tau_1^*}^t\psi_{u_{\tau_1^*}}(s,X_s)ds+\max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-u_{\tau_1^*}}}(-g_{u_{\tau_1^*}j}(t,X_t)+Y_t^j)\mathbf{1}_{[t<T]}\right)_{t\geq\tau_1^*},$$

which completes the proof of the Lemma.

Now, from Lemma 3.1 and the definition of τ_2^* we have:

$$\begin{aligned}Y_{\tau_1^*}^{u_{\tau_1^*}}&=E\left[\int_{\tau_1^*}^{\tau_2^*}\psi_{u_{\tau_1^*}}(s,X_s)ds+\max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-u_{\tau_1^*}}}(-g_{u_{\tau_1^*}j}(\tau_2^*,X_{\tau_2^*})+Y_{\tau_2^*}^j)\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_2^*<T]}|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_1^*}\right]\\&=E\left[\int_{\tau_1^*}^{\tau_2^*}\psi_{u_{\tau_1^*}}(s,X_s)ds+(-g_{u_{\tau_1^*}u_{\tau_2^*}}(\tau_2^*,X_{\tau_2^*})+Y_{\tau_2^*}^{u_{\tau_2^*}})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_2^*<T]}|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_1^*}\right].\end{aligned}$$

It implies that

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_0^1 &= E\left[\int_0^{\tau_1^*} \psi_1(s, X_s)ds - g_{1u_{\tau_1^*}}(\tau_1^*, X_{\tau_1^*})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_1^*<T]}\right] \\
&\quad + E\left[\int_{\tau_1^*}^{\tau_2^*} \psi_{u_{\tau_1^*}}(s, X_s)ds + (-g_{u_{\tau_1^*}u_{\tau_2^*}}(\tau_2^*, X_{\tau_2^*}) + Y_{\tau_2^*}^{u_{\tau_2^*}})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_2^*<T]}\right] \\
&= E\left[\int_0^{\tau_1^*} \psi_1(s, X_s)ds + \int_{\tau_1^*}^{\tau_2^*} \psi_{u_{\tau_1^*}}(s, X_s)ds - g_{1u_{\tau_1^*}}(\tau_1^*, X_{\tau_1^*})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_1^*<T]}\right. \\
&\quad \left. -g_{u_{\tau_1^*}u_{\tau_2^*}}(\tau_2^*, X_{\tau_2^*})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_2^*<T]} + Y_{\tau_2^*}^{u_{\tau_2^*}}\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_2^*<T]}\right],
\end{aligned}$$

since $[\tau_2^* < T] \subset [\tau_1^* < T]$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_0^1 &= \mathbf{E}\left(\int_0^{\tau_2^*} \psi(s, X_s, u_s)ds - g_{1u_{\tau_1^*}}(\tau_1^*, X_{\tau_1^*})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_1^*<T]}\right. \\
&\quad \left. - g_{u_{\tau_1^*}u_{\tau_2^*}}(\tau_2^*, X_{\tau_2^*})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_2^*<T]} + Y_{\tau_2^*}^{u_{\tau_2^*}}\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_2^*<T]}\right)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.4}$$

since between 0 and τ_1^* (resp. τ_1^* and τ_2^*) the production is in regime 1 (resp. regime$u_{\tau_1^*}$) and then $u_t = 1$ (resp. $u_t = u_{\tau_1^*}$) which implies that

$$\int_0^{\tau_2^*} \psi(s, X_s, u_s)ds = \int_0^{\tau_1^*} \psi_1(s, X_s)ds + \int_{\tau_1^*}^{\tau_2^*} \psi_{u_{\tau_1^*}}(s, X_s)ds.$$

Repeating this reasoning as many times as necessary we obtain that for any $n \geq 0$,

$$Y_0^1 = E\left[\int_0^{\tau_n^*} \psi(s, X_s, u_s)ds - \sum_{k=1}^{n} g_{u_{\tau_{k-1}^*}u_{\tau_k^*}}(\tau_k^*, X_{\tau_k^*})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_k^*<T]} + Y_{\tau_n^*}^{u_{\tau_n^*}}\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_n^*<T]}\right].$$

Then, the strategy (δ^*, u^*) satisfies :

$$-\infty < E\left[\sum_{k\geq 1} g_{u_{\tau_{k-1}^*}u_{\tau_k^*}}(\tau_k^*, X_{\tau_k^*})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_k^*<T]}\right] < +\infty.$$

If not $Y_0^1 = \pm\infty$ which contradicts the assumption $Y^i \in \mathcal{S}^2$. Therefore, taking the limit as $n \to +\infty$ we obtain $Y_0^1 = J(\delta^*, u^*)$.

Step 2. (ii) We show that the strategy (δ^*, u^*) is optimal i.e. $J(\delta^*, u^*) \geq J(\delta, u)$ for any $(\delta, u) \in \mathcal{D}$. The definition of the Snell envelope yields

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_0^1 &\geq E\left[\int_0^{\tau_1} \psi_1(s, X_s)ds + \max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-1}}(-g_{1j}(\tau_1, X_{\tau_1}) + Y_{\tau_1}^j)\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_1<T]}\right] \\
&\geq E\left[\int_0^{\tau_1} \psi_1(s, X_s)ds + (-g_{1u_{\tau_1}}(\tau_1, X_{\tau_1}) + Y_{\tau_1}^{u_{\tau_1}})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_1<T]}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

But, once more using a similar characterization as we get

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\tau_1}^{u_{\tau_1}} &\geq E\left[\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \psi_{u_{\tau_1}}(s,X_s)ds + \max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-u_{\tau_1}}}(-g_{u_{\tau_1}j}(\tau_2,X_{\tau_2}) + Y_{\tau_2}^{j})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_2<T]}|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_1}\right] \\ &\geq E\left[\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \psi_{u_{\tau_1}}(s,X_s)ds + (-g_{u_{\tau_1}u_{\tau_2}}(\tau_2,X_{\tau_2}) + Y_{\tau_2}^{u_{\tau_2}})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_2<T]}|\mathcal{F}_{\tau_1}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_0^1 &\geq E\left[\int_0^{\tau_1} \psi_1(s,X_s)ds - g_{1u_{\tau_1}}(\tau_1,X_{\tau_1})\right] \\ &\quad +E\left[\int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \psi_{u_{\tau_1}}(s,X_s)ds + (-g_{u_{\tau_1}u_{\tau_2}}(\tau_2,X_{\tau_2}) + Y_{\tau_2}^{u_{\tau_2}})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_2<T]}\right] \\ &= E\left[\int_0^{\tau_2} \psi_{u_s}(s,X_s)ds - g_{1u_{\tau_1}}(\tau_1,X_{\tau_1})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_1<T]}\right. \\ &\quad \left. -g_{u_{\tau_1}u_{\tau_2}}(\tau_2,X_{\tau_2}) + Y_{\tau_2}^{u_{\tau_2}}\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_2<T]}\right]. \end{aligned}$$

Repeat this argument n times to obtain

$$Y_0^1 \geq E\left[\int_0^{\tau_n} \psi_{u_s}(s,X_s)ds - \sum_{k=1}^{n} g_{u_{\tau_{k-1}}u_{\tau_k}}(\tau_k,X_{\tau_k})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_k<T]} + Y_{\tau_n}^{u_{\tau_n}}\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_n<T]}\right].$$

Finally, taking the limit as $n \to +\infty$ yields

$$Y_0^1 \geq E\left[\int_0^{T} \psi_{u_s}(s,X_s)ds - \sum_{k\geq 1} g_{u_{\tau_{k-1}}u_{\tau_k}}(\tau_k,X_{\tau_k})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_k<T]}\right].$$

Hence, the strategy (δ^*, u^*) is optimal.

Step 3. (iii)Let us show now that the optimal strategy (δ^*, u^*) is admissible, that is we should prove that $\mathbf{P}[\tau_n^* < T \ , \ \forall \ n \geq 0] = 0$. Let's assume the contrary
i.e. $\mathbf{P}[\tau_n^* < T \ , \ \forall \ n \geq 0] > 0$ and show by contradiction that is impossible.
Hence thanks to the definition of τ_n^* , we have:

$$\mathbf{P}[\ \ Y_{\tau_n^*}^{u_{\tau^*_{n-1}}} = -g_{u_{\tau^*_{n-1}}u_{\tau^*_n}}(\tau_n^*, X_{\tau_n^*}) + Y_{\tau_n^*}^{u_{\tau_n^*}},\ u_{\tau_n^*} \in \mathcal{I}^{-u_{\tau^*_{n-1}}},\ \forall n \geq 1] > 0$$

Since $\mathcal{I}$ is finite then there is a state $k_1 \in \mathcal{I}$ where $k_1 = u_{\tau_n^*}$ and a loop $k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_r, k_1$ of elements of $\mathcal{I}$ such that:

$$\mathbf{P}[\ \ Y_{\tau_n^*}^{u_{\tau^*_{j-1}}} = -g_{u_{\tau^*_{j-1}}u_{\tau^*_j}}(\tau_n^*, X_{\tau_n^*}) + Y_{\tau_n^*}^{u_{\tau_j^*}},\ j = 1, \ldots, r\ , (k_{r+1} = k_1)\ \forall\ n \geq 1] > 0$$

Therefore taking the limit w.r.t. n to obtain:

$$\mathbf{P}[\ \ Y_{\tau}^{u_{\tau^*_{j-1}}} = -g_{u_{\tau^*_{j-1}}u_{\tau^*_j}}(\tau, X_{\tau}) + Y_{\tau}^{u_{\tau_j^*}},\ j = 1, \ldots, r\ , (k_{r+1} = k_1)\ ] > 0.$$

Where $\tau := \lim\limits_{n\to\infty} \tau_n^*$. But this implies that:

$$\mathbf{P}[g_{u_{\tau^*_{k_1}} u_{\tau^*_{k_2}}}(\tau, X_\tau) + \ldots + g_{u_{\tau^*_{k_r}} u_{\tau^*_{k_1}}}(\tau, X_\tau) = 0] > 0,$$

wich contradicts (2.9). Therefore $\mathbf{P}[\tau_n^* < T \ , \ \forall \ n \geq 0] = 0$.
Then the optimal strategy is admissible.□

3.2 Existence of the processes $Y^i, i = 1, \ldots, m$

we will now establish existence of the processes $Y^1, \ldots, Y^m$. They will be obtained as a limit of a sequence of processes $(Y^{1,n}, \ldots, Y^{m,n})$ defined recursively by means of the snell envelope notion as follows:
For $i \in \mathcal{I}$, we set, for any $0 \leq t \leq T$,

$$Y_t^{i,0} = E\left[\int_t^T \psi_i(s, X_s)ds|\mathcal{F}_t\right], \ 0 \leq t \leq T, \tag{3.5}$$

and for $n \geq 1$,

$$Y_t^{i,n} = \operatorname*{esssup}_{\tau \geq t} E\left[\int_t^\tau \psi_i(s, X_s)ds + \max_{k \in \mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ik}(\tau, X_\tau) + Y_\tau^{k,n-1})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau < T]}|\mathcal{F}_t\right], \ 0 \leq t \leq T. \tag{3.6}$$

Next we will give some useful properties of $Y^{1,n}, \ldots, Y^{m,n}$.

Lemma 3.2 *For any $n \geq 0$, the processes $Y^{1,n}, \ldots, Y^{m,n}$ are continuous and belong to $\mathcal{S}^2$.*

Proof. Let us show by induction that for any $n \geq 0$ and every $i \in \mathcal{I}$, the $Y^{i,n}$'s are continuous and belong to $\mathcal{S}^2$.
For $n = 0$ the property holds true since we can write $Y^{i,0}$ as the sum of a continuous process and a martingale w.r.t to the Brownian filtration wich is continuous, therefore $Y^{i,0}$ is continuous and since the process $(\psi_i(s, X_s))_{0 \leq s \leq T}$ belongs to $\mathcal{M}^2$ then by using Doob's inequality we obtain that $Y^{i,0}$ belong to $\mathcal{S}^2$.
Suppose now that the property is satisfied fore some n:
For every $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and up to a term, $Y^{i,n+1}$ is the Snell envelope of the process:
$\left(\int_0^t \psi_i(s, X_s)ds + \max\limits_{k \in \mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ik}(t, X_t) + Y_t^{k,n})\mathbf{1}_{[t<T]}\right)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ and verifies $Y_T^{i,n+1} = 0$.
The process $\max\limits_{k \in \mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ik}(t, X_t) + Y_t^{k,n})\mathbf{1}_{[t<T]}$ is continuous on $[0, T)$ thanks to the continuity of $Y_t^{k,n}$, and at T we have two cases:

(a) if $g_{ik}(t, X_t)$ is positive then $\max\limits_{k \in \mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ik}(t, X_t) + Y_t^{k,n})|_{t=T} < 0$. Thus the process $\max\limits_{k \in \mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ik}(t, X_t) + Y_t^{k,n})$ is continuous on $[0, T)$ and has a positive jump at T since $Y_T^{i,n+1} = 0$. So $Y^{i,n+1}$ is continuous on $[0, T]$.

(b) if $g_{ik}(t, X_t)$ is negative then $\max\limits_{k \in \mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ik}(t, X_t) + Y_t^{k,n})|_{t=T} = 0$ since $g_{ik}(T, X_T) = 0$. Thus $Y^{i,n+1}$ is continuous on $[0, T]$.

Therefore $Y^{i,n+1}$ is continuous and belongs to $\mathcal{S}^2$.

This shows that for any $n \geq 0$ and every $i \in \mathcal{I}$, the $Y^{i,n}$'s are continuous and belong to $\mathcal{S}^2$.$\Box$

Proposition 3.1 *For any $i \in \mathcal{I}$, the sequence $(Y^{i,n})_{n\geq 0}$ converges increasingly and pointwisely P-a.s. for any $0 \leq t \leq T$ and in $\mathcal{M}^2$ to càdlàg processes $\tilde{Y^i}$. Moreover these limit processes $\tilde{Y^i} = (\tilde{Y^i_t})_{0\leq t\leq T}, i = 1, \ldots, m$, satisfy the following:*

(a) $E\left[\sup_{0\leq t\leq T} |\tilde{Y^i_t}|^2\right] < +\infty$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

(b) *For any $0 \leq t \leq T$ we have:*

$$\tilde{Y^i_t} = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{\tau\geq t} E\left[\int_t^\tau \psi_i(s, X_s)ds + \max_{k\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ik}(\tau, X_\tau) + \tilde{Y^k_\tau})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau<T]}|\mathcal{F}_t\right]. \tag{3.7}$$

Proof. Let us now set $\mathcal{D}_t^{i,n} = \{u \in \mathcal{D} \textit{ such that } u_0 = i, \tau_1 \geq t, \textit{and } \tau_{n+1} = T\}$.

Using the same arguments as the ones of the verification theorem, the following characterization of the processes $Y^{i,n}$ holds true:

$$Y_t^{i,n} = \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{u\in\mathcal{D}_t^{i,n}} E\left[\int_t^T \psi_{u_s}(s)ds - \sum_{j=1}^n g_{u_{\tau_{j-1}}u_{\tau_j}}(\tau_j, X_{\tau_j})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_j<T]}|\mathcal{F}_t\right]$$

Since $\mathcal{D}_t^{i,n} \subset \mathcal{D}_t^{i,n+1}$, we have P-a.s. for all $t \in [0, T]$, $Y_t^{i,n} \leq Y_t^{i,n+1}$ thanks to the continuity of $Y^{i,n}$. Moreover we have:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_t^{i,n} \quad &\leq \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{u\in\mathcal{D}_t^{i,n}} E\left[\int_t^T \psi_{u_s}(s)ds + \sum_{j=1}^n(-g_{u_{\tau_{j-1}}u_{\tau_j}}(\tau_j, X_{\tau_j}))\mathbf{1}_{[g_{ij}<0]}\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_j<T]}|\mathcal{F}_t\right] \\ &\leq E\left(\int_t^T \max_{i\in\mathcal{I}} |\psi_i(s, X_s)|ds|\mathcal{F}_t\right) + E\left[\sum_{g_{ij}<0} \max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(\sup_{s\leq T}(-g_{ij}(s, X_s))|\mathcal{F}_t\right] \\ &\leq E\left(\int_t^T \max_{i\in\mathcal{I}} |\psi_i(s, X_s)|ds|\mathcal{F}_t\right) + KE\left[\max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(\sup_{s\leq T} |g_{ij}(s, X_s)|)|\mathcal{F}_t\right] \end{aligned}$$

This latter inequality follows from assumption (2.10).

Therefore, for every $i \in \mathcal{I}$, the sequence $(Y^{i,n})_{n\geq 0}$ is increasing in n and satisfies

$$Y_t^{i,n} \leq E\left(\int_t^T \max_{i\in\mathcal{I}} |\psi_i(s, X_s)|ds|\mathcal{F}_t\right) + KE\left[\max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(\sup_{s\leq T} |g_{ij}(s, X_s)|)|\mathcal{F}_t\right], \quad 0 \leq t \leq T. \tag{3.8}$$

Thus $(Y^{i,n})_{n\geq 0}$ converges to some limit $\tilde{Y^i_t} := \lim_{n\to+\infty} Y_t^{i,n}$ that satisfies

$$Y_t^{i,0} \leq \tilde{Y^i_t} \leq E\left(\int_t^T \max_{i\in\mathcal{I}} |\psi_i(s, X_s)|ds|\mathcal{F}_t\right) + KE\left[\max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(\sup_{s\leq T} |g_{ij}(s, X_s)|)|\mathcal{F}_t\right], \quad 0 \leq t \leq T. \tag{3.9}$$

Next, using the smoothness properties of ψ_i and g_{ij}, Doob's Maximal Inequality yield, for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$

$$E(\sup_{t\le T} |\tilde{Y_t^i}|^2) < +\infty.$$

By the Lebesgue Dominated Convergence Theorem, the sequence $(Y^{i,n})_{n\ge 0}$ also converges to $\tilde{Y^i}$ in $\mathcal{M}^2$. Let us now show that $\tilde{Y^i}$ is càdlàg. Actually, for each $i \in \mathcal{I}$ and $n \ge 1$, by (3.6) the process $\left(Y_t^{i,n} + \int_0^t \psi(s, X_s)ds\right)_{0\le t\le T}$ is a continuous supermartingale. Hence its limit process $(\tilde{Y_t^i} + \int_0^t \psi(s, X_s)ds)_{0\le t\le T}$ is càdlàg as a limit of increasing sequence of continuous supermartingales (see Dellacherie and Meyer, pp.86). Therefore $\tilde{Y^i}$ is càdlàg.

Finally, since the càdlàg processes $\tilde{Y^1}, \ldots, \tilde{Y^m}$ are limits of the sequence of increasing continuous processes $Y^{i,n}, i \in \mathcal{I}$ that satisfy (3.6). Then by Snell envelope properties, the processes $\tilde{Y^1}, \ldots, \tilde{Y^m}$ satisfy (3.7).□

We will now prove that the processes $\tilde{Y^1}, \ldots, \tilde{Y^m}$ are continuous and satisfy the verification theorem.

Theorem 3.2 *The limit processes $\tilde{Y}^1, \ldots, \tilde{Y}^m$ satisfy the verification theorem.*

Proof. Recall from Proposition 3.1 that the processes $\tilde{Y}^1, \ldots, \tilde{Y}^m$ are càdlàg and uniformly L^2-integrable and satisfy (3.1). It remains to prove that they are continuous.

Indeed, note that, for $i \in \mathcal{I}$, the process $(\tilde{Y}_t^i + \int_0^t \psi_i(s)ds)_{0\le t\le T}$ is the snell envelope of

$$\left(\int_0^t \psi_i(s, X_s)ds + \max_{k\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ik}(t, X_t) + \tilde{Y}_t^k)\mathbf{1}_{[t<T]}\right)_{0\le t\le T}$$

since the processes $(\int_0^t \psi_i(s, X_s)ds)_{0\le t\le T}$ are continuous. Therefore from the property of the jumps of the snell envelope (see [12]; Proposition 2 (ii)), when there is a (necessarily negative) jump of $\tilde{Y}_t^i$ at t, there is a jump, at the same time t, of the process $\left(\max_{k\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ik}(t, X_t) + \tilde{Y}_t^k)\right)_{0\le t<T}$. Since g_{ij} are continuous, there is $j \in \mathcal{I}^{-i}$ such that $\Delta_t \tilde{Y}^j < 0$, and $\tilde{Y}_{t-}^i = -g_{ik}(t, X_t) + \tilde{Y}_{t-}^j$.

Suppose now there is an index $i_1 \in \mathcal{I}$ for which there exists $t \in [0, T]$ such that $\Delta_t \tilde{Y}^{i_1} < 0$. This implies that there exists another index $i_2 \in \mathcal{I}^{-i_1}$ such that $\Delta_t \tilde{Y}^{i_2} < 0$ and $\tilde{Y}_{t-}^{i_1} = -g_{i_1 i_2}(t, X_t) + \tilde{Y}_{t-}^{i_2}$. But given i_2, there exists an index $i_3 \in \mathcal{I}^{-i_2}$ such that $\Delta_t \tilde{Y}^{i_3} < 0$ and $\tilde{Y}_{t-}^{i_2} = -g_{i_2 i_3}(t, X_t) + \tilde{Y}_{t-}^{i_3}$. Repeating this argument many times, we get a sequence of indices $i_1, ..., i_j, ... \in \mathcal{I}$ that have the property that $i_k \in \mathcal{I}^{-i_{k-1}}$, $\Delta_t \tilde{Y}^{i_k} < 0$ and $\tilde{Y}_{t-}^{i_{k-1}} = -g_{i_{k-1} i_k}(t, X_t) + \tilde{Y}_{t-}^{i_k}$.

Since $\mathcal{I}$ is finite, there exist two indices $m < r$ such that $i_m = i_r$ and $i_m, i_{m+1}, ..., i_{r-1}$ are mutually different. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{Y}_{t-}^{i_m} &= -g_{i_m i_{m+1}}(t, X_t) + \tilde{Y}_{t-}^{i_{m+1}} \\
&= -g_{i_m i_{m+1}}(t, X_t) - g_{i_{m+1} i_{m+2}}(t, X_t) + \tilde{Y}_{t-}^{i_{m+2}} \\
&= ... \\
&= -g_{i_m i_{m+1}}(t, X_t) - ... - g_{i_{r-1} i_r}(t, X_t) + \tilde{Y}_{t-}^{i_r}
\end{aligned}$$

As $i_m = i_r$ we get

$$-g_{i_m i_{m+1}}(t, X_t) - \ldots - g_{i_{r-1} i_r}(t, X_t) = 0$$

Which contradicts assumption (2.9). Therefore there is no $i \in \mathcal{I}$ for which there is a $t \in [0, T]$ such that $\Delta_t \tilde{Y}^i < 0$. This means that the processes $\tilde{Y}^1, \ldots, \tilde{Y}^m$ are continuous. Since they satisfy (3.1), then by uniqueness $Y^i = \tilde{Y}^i$ for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$.

Thus the verification theorem is satisfied by $\tilde{Y}^1, \ldots, \tilde{Y}^m$.□

4 Existence of a solution for the system of variational inequalities

4.1 Connection with BSDEs with one reflecting barrier

Let $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^k$ and let $(X_s^{tx})_{s \leq T}$ be the solution of the following standard SDE:

$$dX_s^{tx} = b(s, X_s^{tx})ds + \sigma(s, X_s^{tx})dB_s \text{ for } t \leq s \leq T \text{ and } X_s^{tx} = x \text{ for } s \leq t \tag{4.1}$$

where the functions b and σ are the ones of (2.6). These properties of σ and b imply in particular that the process $(X_s^{tx})_{0 \leq s \leq T}$ solution of the standard SDE (4.1) exists and is unique, for any $t \in [0, T]$ and $x \in \mathbf{R}^k$.

The operator $\mathcal{A}$ that appears in (2.4) is the infinitesimal generator associated with $X^{t,x}$. In the following result we collect some properties of $X^{t,x}$.

Proposition 4.1 *(see e.g. [27]) The process X^{tx} satisfies the following estimates:*

(*i*) *For any $q \geq 2$, there exists a constant C such that*

$$E[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} |X_s^{tx}|^q] \leq C(1 + |x|^q). \tag{4.2}$$

(*ii*) *There exists a constant C such that for any $t, t' \in [0, T]$ and $x, x' \in \mathbf{R}^k$,*

$$E[\sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} |X_s^{tx} - X_s^{t'x'}|^2] \leq C(1 + |x|^2)(|x - x'|^2 + |t - t'|).\square \tag{4.3}$$

We are going now to introduce the notion of a BSDE with one reflecting barrier introduced in [19]. This notion will allow us to make the connection between the variational inequalities system and the m-states optimal switching problem described in the previous section.

So let us introduce the deterministic functions $f : [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^{k+1+d} \to \mathbf{R}$, $h : [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^k \to \mathbf{R}$ and $g : \mathbf{R}^k \to \mathbf{R}$ continuous, of polynomial growth and such that $h(x, T) \leq g(x)$. Moreover we assume that for any $(t, x) \in [0, T] \times \mathbf{R}^k$, the mapping $(y, z) \in \mathbf{R}^{1+d} \mapsto f(t, x, y, z)$ is uniformly Lipschitz. Then we have the following result related to BSDEs with one reflecting barrier:

Theorem 4.1 *([19], Th. 5.2 and 8.5) For any* $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbf{R}^k$, *there exits a unique triple of processes* $(Y^{t,x}, Z^{t,x}, K^{t,x})$ *such that:*

$$\begin{cases} Y^{tx}, K^{tx} \in \mathcal{S}^2 \text{ and } Z^{tx} \in \mathcal{M}^{2,d};\ K^{tx} \text{ is non-decreasing and } K_0^{tx} = 0, \\ Y_s^{tx} = g(X_T^{tx}) + \int_s^T f(r, X_r^{tx}, Y_r^{tx}, Z_r^{tx})dr - \int_s^T Z_r^{tx} dB_r + K_T^{tx} - K_s^{tx},\ s \leq T \\ Y_s^{tx} \geq h(s, X_s^{tx}),\ \forall s \leq T \text{ and } \int_0^T (Y_r^{tx} - h(r, X_r^{tx}))dK_r^{tx} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{4.4}$$

Moreover the following characterization of $Y^{t,x}$ *as a Snell envelope holds true:*

$$\forall s \leq T,\ Y_s^{t,x} = esssup_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_t} E\left[\int_t^\tau f(r, X_r^{tx}, Y_r^{tx}, Z_r^{tx})dr + h(\tau, X_\tau^{tx})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau<T]} + g(X_T^{tx})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau=T]}|\mathcal{F}_s\right] \tag{4.5}$$

On the other hand there exists a deterministic continuous with polynomial growth function $u : [0,T] \times \mathbf{R}^k \to \mathbf{R}$ *such that:*

$$\forall s \in [t,T], Y_s^{t,x} = u(s, X_s^{t,x}).$$

Moreover the function u *is the unique viscosity solution in the class of continuous function with polynomial growth of the following PDE with obstacle:*

$$\begin{cases} \min\{u(t,x) - h(t,x), -\partial_t u(t,x) - \mathcal{A}u(t,x) - f(t,x,u(t,x),\sigma(t,x)^*\nabla u(t,x))\} = 0, \\ u(T,x) = g(x). \Box \end{cases}$$

4.2 Existence of a solution for the system of variational inequalities

Let $(Y_s^{1,tx}, ..., Y_s^{m,tx})_{0 \leq s \leq T}$ be the processes which satisfy the Verification Theorem 3.1 in the case when the process $X \equiv X^{t,x}$. Therefore using the characterization (4.5), there exist processes $K^{i,tx}$ and $Z^{i,tx}$, $i \in \mathcal{I}$, such that the triples $(Y^{i,tx}, Z^{i,tx}, K^{i,tx})$ are unique solutions of the following reflected BSDEs: for any $i = 1, ..., m$ we have,

$$\begin{cases} Y^{i,tx}, K^{i,tx} \in \mathcal{S}^2 \text{ and } Z^{i,tx} \in \mathcal{M}^{2,d};\ K^{i,tx} \text{ is non-decreasing and } K_0^{i,tx} = 0, \\ Y_s^{i,tx} = \int_s^T \psi_i(r, X_r^{tx})du - \int_s^T Z_r^{i,tx} dB_r + K_T^{i,tx} - K_s^{i,tx},\ 0 \leq s \leq T,\ Y_T^{i,tx} = 0, \\ Y_s^{i,tx} \geq \max\limits_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{-i}} (-g_{ij}(s, X_s^{tx}) + Y_s^{j,tx}),\ 0 \leq s \leq T, \\ \int_0^T (Y_r^{i,tx} - \max\limits_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{-i}} (-g_{ij}(r, X_r^{tx}) + Y_r^{j,tx}))dK_r^{i,tx} = 0. \end{cases} \tag{4.6}$$

Moreover we have the following result.

Proposition 4.2 *There are deterministic functions* $v^1, ..., v^m : [0,T] \times \mathbf{R}^k \to \mathbf{R}$ *such that:*

$$\forall (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbf{R}^k, \forall s \in [t,T], Y_s^{i,tx} = v^i(s, X_s^{tx}),\ i = 1, ..., m.$$

Moreover the functions v^i, $i = 1, ..., m$, *are of polynomial growth.*

Proof. For $n \geq 0$ let $(Y_s^{n,1,tx}, ..., Y_s^{n,m,tx})_{0 \leq s \leq T}$ be the processes constructed in (3.5)-(3.6). Therefore using an induction argument and Theorem 4.1 there exist deterministic continuous with polynomial growth functions $v^{i,n}$ $(i=1,...,m)$ such that for any $(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbf{R}^k$, $\forall s\in[t,T]$, $Y_s^{n,i,tx}=v^{i,n}(s,X_s^{tx})$. Using now the inequality (3.8), and after taking expectations since $Y_t^{n,i,tx}$ is deterministic, we get:

$$Y_t^{n,i,tx}\le Y_t^{n+1,i,tx}\le E\left(\int_t^T \max_{i\in\mathcal{I}}|\psi_i(s,X_s)|ds|\mathcal{F}_t\right)+E\left[\sum_{g_{ij}<0}\max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(\sup_{s\le T}(-g_{ij}(s,X_s))|\mathcal{F}_t\right].$$

Therefore combining the polynomial growth of ψ_i and g_{ij} and estimate (4.2) for X^{tx}, we obtain:

$$v^{i,n}(t,x)\le v^{i,n+1}(t,x)\le C_K(1+|x|^\gamma)$$

for some constants C_K and γ independent of n. In order to complete the proof it is enough now to set $v^i(t,x):=\lim_{n\to\infty}v^{i,n}(t,x),\quad (t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbf{R}^k$ since $Y^{i,n,tx}\nearrow Y^{i,tx}$ as $n\to\infty$. □

We are now going to focus on the continuity of the functions $v^1,...,v^m$.

Theorem 4.2 *The functions* $(v^1,...,v^m):[0,T]\times\mathbf{R}^k\to\mathbf{R}$ *are continuous and solution in viscosity sense of the system of variational inequalities with inter-connected obstacles (2.3).*

Proof: Let us show that v^i is continuous. First we have that $v^i(t,x)=Y_t^{i,tx}$, then:

$$|Y_t^{i,tx}-Y_{t'}^{i,t'x'}|\le|Y_t^{i,tx}-Y_t^{i,n,tx}|+|Y_t^{i,n,tx}-Y_{t'}^{i,n,t'x'}|+|Y_{t'}^{i,n,t'x'}-Y_{t'}^{i,t'x'}| \tag{4.7}$$

Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned}|Y_t^{i,n,tx}-Y_{t'}^{i,n,t'x'}| &\le |Y_t^{i,n,tx}-Y_t^{i,n,t'x'}|+|Y_t^{i,n,t'x'}-Y_{t'}^{i,n,t'x'}|\\ &\le \sup_{0\le s\le T}|Y_s^{i,n,tx}-Y_s^{i,n,t'x'}|+|Y_t^{i,n,t'x'}-Y_{t'}^{i,n,t'x'}| \qquad (4.8)\end{aligned}$$

Next we we will show the L^2 continuity of the value functions $(t,x)\to Y^{i,n,tx}$.
Recall that

$$Y_s^{i,n,tx}=\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{u\in\mathcal{D}_s^{i,n}}E\left[\int_s^T\psi_{u_s}(s,X_s)ds-\sum_{j=1}^n g_{u_{\tau_{j-1}}u_{\tau_j}}(\tau_j,X_{\tau_j})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_j<T]}|\mathcal{F}_s\right]$$

Where $\mathcal{D}_s^{i,n} = \{u \in \mathcal{D} \ such\ that\ u_0 = i, \tau_1 \geq s,\ and\ \tau_{n+1} = T\}$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\left|Y_s^{i,n,tx} - Y_s^{i,n,t^{'}x^{'}}\right| &= \Bigg|\operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{u\in\mathcal{D}_s^{i,n}} E\left[\int_s^T \psi_{u_r}(r, X_r^{tx})dr - \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_{u_{\tau_{j-1}}u_{\tau_j}}(\tau_j, X_{\tau_j}^{tx})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_j<T]}|\mathcal{F}_s\right] \\
&\quad - \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{u\in\mathcal{D}_s^{i,n}} E\left[\int_s^T \psi_{u_r}(r, X_r^{t^{'}x^{'}})dr - \sum_{j=1}^{n} g_{u_{\tau_{j-1}}u_{\tau_j}}(\tau_j, X_{\tau_j}^{t^{'}x^{'}})\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_j<T]}|\mathcal{F}_s\right]\Bigg| \\
&\leq \operatorname*{ess\,sup}_{u\in\mathcal{D}_s^{i,n}} E\Bigg[\int_s^T \left|\psi_{u_r}(r, X_r^{tx}) - \psi_{u_r}(r, X_r^{t^{'}x^{'}}\right| dr \\
&\quad + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left|\left(g_{u_{\tau_{j-1}}u_{\tau_j}}(\tau_j, X_{\tau_j}^{tx}) - g_{u_{\tau_{j-1}}u_{\tau_j}}(\tau_j, X_{\tau_j}^{t^{'}x^{'}})\right)\mathbf{1}_{[\tau_j<T]}\right| |\mathcal{F}_s\Bigg] \\
&\leq E\Bigg[\int_0^T \max_{i\in\mathcal{I}} \left|\psi_{u_r}(r, X_r^{tx}) - \psi_{u_r}(r, X_r^{t^{'}x^{'}})\right| dr \\
&\quad + n \max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}} \left\{\sup_{0\leq r\leq T} \left|g_{ij}(r, X_r^{tx}) - g_{ij}(r, X_r^{t^{'}x^{'}})\right|\right\} |\mathcal{F}_s\Bigg]
\end{aligned}$$

Now using Doob's maximal inequality and taking expectation , there exists a constant $C \geq 0$ such that:

$$\begin{aligned}
E\left[\sup_{0\leq s\leq T} |Y_s^{i,n,tx} - Y_s^{i,n,t^{'}x^{'}}|^2\right] &\leq CE\Bigg[\Bigg(\int_0^T \max_{i\in\mathcal{I}} |\psi_{u_r}(r, X_r^{tx}) - \psi_{u_r}(r, X_r^{t^{'}x^{'}})|dr \\
&\quad + n \max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}\{\sup_{0\leq r\leq T} |g_{ij}(r, X_r^{tx}) - g_{ij}(r, X_r^{t^{'}x^{'}})|\}\Bigg)^2\Bigg]
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Then using continuity and polynomial growth of ψ_i and g_{ij}, estimate (4.3) for X_r^{tx} and $X_r^{t^{'}x^{'}}$, and finally the lebesgue dominated convergence theorem, one can show that the right hand side of (4.9) converges to 0 as $(t^{'}, x^{'}) \to (t, x)$. Thus we obtain that:

$$E\left[\sup_{0\leq s\leq T} |Y_s^{i,n,tx} - Y_s^{i,n,t^{'}x^{'}}|^2\right] \to 0 \ as\ (t^{'}, x^{'}) \to (t, x). \tag{4.10}$$

Then the function $(s, t, x) \to Y_s^{i,n,tx}$ is continuous from $[0, T]^2 \times \mathbf{R}^k$ into L^2, which is the desired result.

Next, recall that from (4.7) and (4.8) we have,

$$|Y_t^{i,tx} - Y_{t^{'}}^{i,t^{'}x^{'}}| \leq |Y_t^{i,tx} - Y_t^{i,n,tx}| + \sup_{0\leq s\leq T} |Y_s^{i,n,tx} - Y_s^{i,n,t^{'}x^{'}}| + |Y_t^{i,n,t^{'}x^{'}} - Y_{t^{'}}^{i,n,t^{'}x^{'}}| + |Y_{t^{'}}^{i,n,t^{'}x^{'}} - Y_{t^{'}}^{i,t^{'}x^{'}}|. \tag{4.11}$$

As n is arbitrary then putting $n \to +\infty$ and using the fact that $\lim_{n\to\infty} Y^{i,n,tx} := Y^{i,tx}$ and the continuity of $Y_t^{i,n,tx}$ in t, together with (4.10) we get that the right hand side terms of (4.11) converge to 0 as

$(t^{'},x^{'}) \to (t,x)$. Therefore $Y^{i,t^{'}x^{'}}_{t^{'}} \to Y^{i,tx}_t$ as $(t^{'},x^{'}) \to (t,x)$.
So $v^i, i \in \mathcal{I}$ are continuous.

5 Uniqueness of the solution of the system of Variational Inequalities

In this section we are going to show the uniqueness of the viscosity solution of the system (2.3). We first need the following lemma.

Lemma 5.1 *Let $(v_i(t,x))_{i=1,\dots,m}$ be a supersolution of the system (2.3), then for any $\gamma \geq 0$ there exists $\alpha > 0$ wich does not depend on θ such that for any $\lambda \geq \alpha$ and $\theta > 0$, the m-uplet $(v_i(t,x) + \theta e^{-\lambda t} \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2})_{i=1,\dots,m}$ is a supersolution for (2.3).*

Proof. We assume w.l.o.g. that the functions $(v_i(t,x))_{i=1,\dots,m}$ are lsc. Let $i \in \mathcal{I}$ be fixed and let $\varphi \in \mathcal{C}^{1,2}$ be such that the function $\varphi - (v_i + \theta e^{-\lambda t} \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2})$ has a local maximum in (t,x) which is equal to 0. Since $(v_i(t,x))_{i=1,\dots,m}$ is a supersolution for (2.3), then we have: $\forall i \in \mathcal{I}$,

$$\begin{aligned}&\min\Big\{ v_i(t,x) - \max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}\{-g_{ij}(t,x)+v_j(t,x)\}, -\partial_t(\varphi_i(t,x) - \theta e^{-\lambda t} \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2}) \\ &-\tfrac{1}{2}Tr[\sigma.\sigma^*(t,x)D^2_x(\varphi(t,x) - \theta e^{-\lambda t} \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2})] - D_x(\varphi(t,x) - \theta e^{-\lambda t} \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2}).b(t,x) - \phi_i(t,x)\Big\} \geq 0\end{aligned}$$

Hence

$$\begin{aligned}&(v_i(t,x) + \theta e^{-\lambda t} \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2}) - \max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ij}(t,x) + (v_j(t,x) + \theta e^{-\lambda t} \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2})) \\ &= v_i(t,x) - \max_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-g_{ij}(t,x) + v_j(t,x)) \geq 0 \qquad (5.1)\end{aligned}$$

On the other hand:

$$\begin{aligned}&-\partial_t(\varphi(t,x) - \theta e^{-\lambda t} \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2}) - \tfrac{1}{2}Tr[\sigma.\sigma^*(t,x)D^2_x(\varphi(t,x) - \theta e^{-\lambda t} \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2})] \\ &-D_x(\varphi(t,x) - \theta e^{-\lambda t} \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2}).b(t,x) - \phi_i(t,x) \geq 0\end{aligned}$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned}&-\partial_t\varphi(t,x) - \tfrac{1}{2}Tr[\sigma.\sigma^*(t,x)D^2_x\varphi(t,x)] - D_x(\varphi(t,x)).b(t,x) - \phi_i(t,x) \\ &\geq \theta\lambda e^{-\lambda t} \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2} - \tfrac{1}{2}\theta e^{-\lambda t}Tr[\sigma.\sigma^*(t,x)D^2_x \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2}] - \theta e^{-\lambda t}D_x(\mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2}).b(t,x)\end{aligned} \qquad (5.2)$$

Therefore taking into account the growth conditions on b and σ, there exists two positive constants C_1 and C_2 such that:
$\frac{1}{2}\theta e^{-\lambda t}Tr[\sigma.\sigma^*(t,x)D^2_x \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2}] \leq C_1 \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2}$ and $D_x(\mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2}).b(t,x) \leq C_2 \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2}$.
Then by (5.2) we get

$$-\partial_t\varphi(t,x) - \frac{1}{2}Tr[\sigma.\sigma^*(t,x)D^2_x\varphi(t,x)] - D_x(\varphi(t,x)).b(t,x) - \phi_i(t,x) \geq \theta(\lambda-\alpha)e^{-\lambda t} \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2} \qquad (5.3)$$

where $\alpha = C_1 + C_2$.
So we conclude that for $\lambda \geq \alpha$, the right hand side of (5.3) is non-negative.

Finally noting that i is arbitrary in $\mathcal{I}$ together with (5.1), we obtain that $(v_i(t,x) + \theta e^{-\lambda t} \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2})_{i=1,\dots,m}$ is a viscosity supersolution for (2.3).$\Box$

Now we give an equivalent of quasi-variational inequality (2.3). In this section, we consider the new function Γ_i given by the classical change of variable $\Gamma_i(t,x) = \exp(t)v_i(t,x)$, for any $t \in [0,T]$ and $x \in \mathbf{R}^k$. Of course, the function Γ_i is continuous and of polynomial growth with respect to its arguments.
A second property is given by the

Proposition 5.1 *v_i is a viscosity solution of (2.3) if and only if Γ_i is a viscosity solution to the following quasi-variational inequality in $[0,T[\times\mathbf{R}^k$,*

$$\begin{cases} \min\{\Gamma_i(t,x) - \max\limits_{j\in\mathcal{I}^{-i}}(-e^t g_{ij}(t,x) + \Gamma_j(t,x)), \\ \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad \Gamma_i(t,x) - \partial_t\Gamma_i(t,x) - \mathcal{A}\Gamma_i(t,x) - e^t\psi_i(t,x)\} = 0, \\ \Gamma_i(T,x) = e^T v_i(T,x) = 0.\Box \end{cases} \tag{5.4}$$

We are going now to address the question of uniqueness of the viscosity solution of the system (2.3). We have the following:

Theorem 5.1 *The viscosity solution of the system of variational inequalities with interconnected obstacles (2.3) is unique in the space of continuous functions on $[0,T] \times \mathbf{R}^k$ which satisfy a polynomial growth condition, i.e., in the space*

$$\mathcal{C} := \{\varphi : [0,T] \times \mathbf{R}^k \to \mathbf{R},\ \textit{continuous and for any}$$
$$(t,x),\ |\varphi(t,x)| \le C(1 + |x|^\gamma)\ \textit{for some constants } C \textit{ and } \gamma\}.$$

Proof. We will show by contradiction that if $u_1, ..., u_m$ and $v_1, ..., v_m$ are a subsolution and a supersolution respectively for (5.4) then for any $i = 1, ..., m$, $u_i \le v_i$. Therefore if we have two solutions of (5.4) then they are obviously equal. Next according Lemma 5.1, it is enough to show that for any $i \in \mathcal{I}$, we have:

$$\forall (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbf{R}^k,\quad u_i(t,x) \le v_i(t,x) + \theta e^{-\lambda t} \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2},$$

since in taking the limit as $\theta \to 0$ we get the desired result.
So let us set $w_i(t,x) = v_i(t,x) + \theta e^{-\lambda t} \mid x \mid^{2\gamma+2}$, $(t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbf{R}^k$. Next assume there exists a point $(\bar{t},\bar{x}) \in [0,T] \times \mathbf{R}^k$ such that for $i \in \mathcal{I}$: $\max_{i\in\mathcal{I}}(u_i(\bar{t},\bar{x}) - w_i(\bar{t},\bar{x})) > 0$. Then using the growth condition there exists $R > 0$ such that:

$$\forall (t,x) \in [0,T] \times \mathbf{R}^k s.t. \mid x \mid \ge R,\quad u_i(t,x) - w_i(t,x) < 0.$$

Since $u_i(T,x) = v_i(T,x) = 0$, it implies that

$$\begin{aligned} 0 < \max\nolimits_{(t,x)\in[0,T]\times\mathbf{R}^k} \max\nolimits_{i\in\mathcal{I}}(u_i(t,x) - w_i(t,x)) = \\ \max\nolimits_{(t,x)\in[0,T[\times B_R} \max\nolimits_{i\in\mathcal{I}}(u_i(t,x) - w_i(t,x)) = \max\nolimits_{i\in\mathcal{I}}(u_i(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) - w_i(\widehat{t},\widehat{x})) \end{aligned} \tag{5.5}$$

where $B_R := \{x \in \mathbf{R}^k; |x| < R\}$ and $(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}) \in [0, T[\times B_R$.

Now let us define $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ as:

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}} := \{j \in \mathcal{I},\ u_j(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}) - w_j(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}) = \max_{i \in \mathcal{I}} (u_i(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}) - w_i(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}))\}.$$

First note that $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ is not empty. Here γ is the growth exponent of the functions which w.l.o.g we assume integer and ≥ 2. Next for a small $\epsilon > 0$ and $j \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$, let us set for $(t, x, y) \in [0, T] \times B_R \times B_R$,

$$\phi^j_\epsilon(t, x, y) = u_j(t, x) - w_j(t, y) - \varphi_\epsilon(t, x, y),$$

where,

$$\varphi_\epsilon(t, x, y) = \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \mid x - y \mid^{2\gamma} + \theta(\mid x - \widehat{x} \mid^{2\gamma+2} + \mid y - \widehat{x} \mid^{2\gamma+2}) + \beta(t - \widehat{t})^2$$

and $\beta, \theta > 0$. Now let
$(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) \in [0, T] \times \overline{B}_R \times \overline{B}_R$ be such that :

$$\phi^j_\epsilon(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) = \max_{(t,x,y) \in [0,T] \times \overline{B}_R \times \overline{B}_R} \phi^j_\epsilon(t, x, y)$$

which exists since ϕ^j_ϵ is continuous. On the other hand, from $2\phi^j_\epsilon(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) \geq \phi^j_\epsilon(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, x_\epsilon) + \phi^j_\epsilon(t_\epsilon, y_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2\epsilon} |x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma} \leq (u_j(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon) - u_j(t_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)) + (w_j(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon) - w_j(t_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)), \tag{5.6}$$

and consequently $\frac{1}{2\epsilon}|x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma}$ is bounded, and as $\epsilon \to 0$, $|x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon| \to 0$. Since u_j and w_j are uniformly continuous on $[0, T] \times \overline{B}_R$, then $\frac{1}{2\epsilon}|x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma} \to 0$ as $\epsilon \to 0$.

Since

$$u_j(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}) - w_j(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}) = \phi^j_\epsilon(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}, \widehat{x}) \leq \phi^j_\epsilon(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) \leq u_j(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon) - w_j(t_\epsilon, y_\epsilon), \tag{5.7}$$

it follow as $\epsilon \to 0$ and the continuity of u and w that, up to a subsequence,

$$(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) \to (\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}, \widehat{x}). \tag{5.8}$$

We now claim that for some $k \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ we have:

$$u_k(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}) > \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{-k}} (u_j(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}) - e^{\widehat{t}} g_{kj}(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x})).$$

Indeed if for any $k \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ we have:

$$u_k(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}) \leq \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{-k}} (u_j(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}) - e^{\widehat{t}} g_{kj}(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x})),$$

then there exists $j \in \mathcal{I}^{-k}$ such that:

$$u_k(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}) - u_j(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}) \leq -e^{\widehat{t}} g_{kj}(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}).$$

From the supersolution property of w_j, we have

$$w_k(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}) \geq \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{-k}} (w_j(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}) - e^{\widehat{t}} g_{kj}(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x})).$$

Then

$$w_k(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) - w_j(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) \geq -e^{\widehat{t}} g_{kj}(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}).$$

It follows that

$$u_k(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) - u_j(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) \leq -e^{\widehat{t}} g_{kj}(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) \leq w_k(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) - w_j(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}).$$

Hence

$$u_k(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) - w_k(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) \leq -e^{\widehat{t}} g_{kj}(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) + u_j(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) - w_k(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) \leq u_j(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) - w_j(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}).$$

But since $k \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ then

$$u_k(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) - w_k(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) = u_j(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) - w_j(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) = -e^{\widehat{t}} g_{kj}(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) + u_j(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) - w_k(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}),$$

which implies that j belongs also to $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ and

$$u_k(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) - u_j(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) = -e^{\widehat{t}} g_{kj}(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}).$$

Repeating this procedure as many times as necessary and since $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ is finite we get the existence of a loop of indices $i_1, ..., i_p, i_{p+1}$ of $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ such that $i_p = i_{p+1}$ and

$$g_{i_1,i_2}(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) + ... + g_{i_p,i_{p+1}}(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) = 0.$$

But this contradicts the assumption (2.9), whence the claim holds.
To proceed let us consider $k \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}$ such that:

$$u_k(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) > \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{-k}} (u_j(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}) - g_{kj}(\widehat{t},\widehat{x})). \tag{5.9}$$

By the continuity of u_j and g_{ij} and since $(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, u_k(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon)) \to_\epsilon (\widehat{t},\widehat{x}, u_k(\widehat{t},\widehat{x}))$ then for ϵ small enough we have:

$$u_k(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon) > \max_{j \in \mathcal{I}^{-k}} (u_j(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon) - g_{kj}(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon)). \tag{5.10}$$

Next we have :

$$\left\{\begin{array}{l}
D_t\varphi_\epsilon(t,x,y) = 2\beta(t-\widehat{t}), \\
D_x\varphi_\epsilon(t,x,y) = \frac{\gamma}{\epsilon}(x-y)|x-y|^{2\gamma-2} + \theta(2\gamma+2)(x-\widehat{x})|x-\widehat{x}|^{2\gamma}, \\
D_y\varphi_\epsilon(t,x,y) = -\frac{\gamma}{\epsilon}(x-y)|x-y|^{2\gamma-2} + \theta(2\gamma+2)(y-\widehat{x})|y-\widehat{x}|^{2\gamma}, \\
\\
B(t,x,y) = D^2_{x,y}\varphi_\epsilon(t,x,y) = \frac{1}{\epsilon}\begin{pmatrix} a_1(x,y) & -a_1(x,y) \\ -a_1(x,y) & a_1(x,y) \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} a_2(x) & 0 \\ 0 & a_2(y) \end{pmatrix} \\
\\
\text{ with } a_1(x,y) = \gamma|x-y|^{2\gamma-2}I + \gamma(2\gamma-2)(x-y)(x-y)^*|x-y|^{2\gamma-4} \text{ and} \\
a_2(x) = \theta(2\gamma+2)|x-\widehat{x}|^{2\gamma}I + 2\theta\gamma(2\gamma+2)(x-\widehat{x})(x-\widehat{x})^*|x-\widehat{x}|^{2\gamma-2}.
\end{array}\right. \tag{5.11}$$

Taking into account (5.10) then applying the result by Crandall et al. (Theorem 8.3, [7]) to the function

$$u_k(t,x)-(1-\lambda)w_k(t,y)-\varphi_\epsilon(t,x,y)$$

at the point $(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)$, for any $\epsilon_1>0$, we can find $c,d\in\mathbf{R}$ and $X,Y\in S_k$, such that:

$$\begin{cases} (c, \frac{\gamma}{\epsilon}(x_\epsilon-y_\epsilon)|x_\epsilon-y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma-2}+\theta(2\gamma+2)(x_\epsilon-\widehat{x})|x_\epsilon-\widehat{x}|^{2\gamma}, X)\in J^{2,+}(u_k(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon)), \\ (-d, \frac{\gamma}{\epsilon}(x_\epsilon-y_\epsilon)|x_\epsilon-y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma-2}-\theta(2\gamma+2)(y_\epsilon-\widehat{x})|y_\epsilon-\widehat{x}|^{2\gamma}, Y)\in J^{2,-}w_k(t_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)), \\ c+d=D_t\varphi_\epsilon(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)=2\beta(t_\epsilon-\widehat{t}) \text{ and finally} \\ -(\frac{1}{\epsilon_1}+||B(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)||)I\le \begin{pmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & -Y \end{pmatrix} \le B(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)+\epsilon_1 B(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)^2. \end{cases} \tag{5.12}$$

Taking now into account (5.10), and the definition of viscosity solution, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} &-c+u_k(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon)-\tfrac{1}{2}Tr[\sigma^*(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon)X\sigma(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon)]-\langle\tfrac{\gamma}{\epsilon}(x_\epsilon-y_\epsilon)|x_\epsilon-y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma-2}+ \\ &\qquad\qquad \theta(2\gamma+2)(x_\epsilon-\widehat{x})|x_\epsilon-\widehat{x}|^{2\gamma}, b(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon)\rangle - e^{t_\epsilon}\psi_k(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon)\le 0 \text{ and} \\ &d+w_k(t_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)-\tfrac{1}{2}Tr[\sigma^*(t_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)Y\sigma(t_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)]-\langle\tfrac{\gamma}{\epsilon}(x_\epsilon-y_\epsilon)|x_\epsilon-y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma-2}- \\ &\qquad\qquad \theta(2\gamma+2)(y_\epsilon-\widehat{x})|y_\epsilon-\widehat{x}|^{2\gamma}, b(t_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)\rangle - e^{t_\epsilon}\psi_k(t_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)\ge 0 \end{aligned}$$

which implies that:

$$\begin{aligned} -c-d+u_k(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon)-w_k(t_\epsilon,y_\epsilon) \;&\le \tfrac{1}{2}Tr[\sigma^*(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon)X\sigma(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon)-\sigma^*(t_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)Y\sigma(t_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)] \\ &\quad +\langle\tfrac{\gamma}{\epsilon}(x_\epsilon-y_\epsilon)|x_\epsilon-y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma-2}, b(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon)-b(t_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)\rangle \\ &\quad +\langle\theta(2\gamma+2)(x_\epsilon-\widehat{x})|x_\epsilon-\widehat{x}|^{2\gamma}, b(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon)\rangle \\ &\quad +\langle\theta(2\gamma+2)(y_\epsilon-\widehat{x})|y_\epsilon-\widehat{x}|^{2\gamma}, b(t_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)\rangle \\ &\quad +e^{t_\epsilon}\psi_k(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon)-e^{t_\epsilon}\psi_k(t_\epsilon,y_\epsilon). \end{aligned} \tag{5.13}$$

But from (5.11) there exist two constants C and C_1 such that:

$$||a_1(x_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)||\le C|x_\epsilon-y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma-2} \text{ and } (||a_2(x_\epsilon)||\vee||a_2(y_\epsilon)||)\le C_1\theta.$$

As

$$B=B(t_\epsilon,x_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)=\frac{1}{\epsilon}\begin{pmatrix} a_1(x_\epsilon,y_\epsilon) & -a_1(x_\epsilon,y_\epsilon) \\ -a_1(x_\epsilon,y_\epsilon) & a_1(x_\epsilon,y_\epsilon)\end{pmatrix}+\begin{pmatrix} a_2(x_\epsilon) & 0 \\ 0 & a_2(y_\epsilon)\end{pmatrix}$$

then

$$B\le\frac{C}{\epsilon}|x_\epsilon-y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma-2}\begin{pmatrix} I & -I \\ -I & I\end{pmatrix}+C_1\theta I.$$

It follows that:

$$B+\epsilon_1 B^2\le C(\frac{1}{\epsilon}|x_\epsilon-y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma-2}+\frac{\epsilon_1}{\epsilon^2}|x_\epsilon-y_\epsilon|^{4\gamma-4})\begin{pmatrix} I & -I \\ -I & I\end{pmatrix}+C_1\theta I \tag{5.14}$$

where C and C_1 which hereafter may change from line to line. Choosing now $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon$, yields the relation

$$B + \epsilon_1 B^2 \leq \frac{C}{\epsilon}(|x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma-2} + |x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon|^{4\gamma-4}) \begin{pmatrix} I & -I \\ -I & I \end{pmatrix} + C_1\theta I. \tag{5.15}$$

Now, from (5.12) and (5.15) we get:

$$\frac{1}{2}Tr[\sigma^*(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon)X\sigma(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon) - \sigma^*(t_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)Y\sigma(t_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)] \leq \frac{C}{\epsilon}(|x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma} + |x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon|^{4\gamma-2}) + C_1\theta(1 + |x_\epsilon|^2 + |y_\epsilon|^2).$$

Next

$$\langle \frac{\gamma}{\epsilon}(x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon)|x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma-2}, b(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon) - b(t_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\rangle \leq \frac{C^2}{\epsilon}|x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma}$$

and finally,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle\theta(2\gamma+2)(x_\epsilon - \widehat{x})|x_\epsilon - \widehat{x}|^{2\gamma}, b(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon)\rangle + \langle\theta(2\gamma+2)(y_\epsilon - \widehat{x})|y_\epsilon - \widehat{x}|^{2\gamma}, b(t_\epsilon, y_\epsilon)\rangle \\ \leq C\theta(1 + |x_\epsilon||x_\epsilon - \widehat{x}|^{2\gamma+1} + |y_\epsilon||y_\epsilon - \widehat{x}|^{2\gamma+1}).\end{aligned}$$

So that by plugging into (5.13) we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}-2\beta(t_\epsilon - \widehat{t}) + u_k(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon) - w_k(t_\epsilon, y_\epsilon) \leq \tfrac{C}{\epsilon}(|x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma} + |x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon|^{4\gamma-2}) + \\ C_1\theta(1 + |x_\epsilon|^2 + |y_\epsilon|^2) + \tfrac{C^2}{\epsilon}|x_\epsilon - y_\epsilon|^{2\gamma} + C\theta(1 + |x_\epsilon||x_\epsilon - \widehat{x}|^{2\gamma+1} + |y_\epsilon||y_\epsilon - \widehat{x}|^{2\gamma+1}) + \\ e^{t_\epsilon}\psi_k(t_\epsilon, x_\epsilon) - e^{t_\epsilon}\psi_k(t_\epsilon, y_\epsilon).\end{aligned}$$

By sending $\epsilon \to 0$, $\theta \to 0$ and taking into account of the continuity of ψ_k and $\gamma \geq 2$, we obtain:

$$u_k(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}) - w_k(\widehat{t}, \widehat{x}) \leq 0,$$

which is a contradiction with (5.5). The proof of Theorem 5.1 is now complete. □

References

[1] E. Bayraktar and M. Egami, On the One-Dimensional Optimal Switching Problem, Mathematics of Operations Research, 2010, 35 (1), 140-159.

[2] B. Bouchard, A stochastic target formulation for optimal switching problems in finite horizon, Stochastics, 81 (2009), pp. 171–197.

[3] K. A. Brekke and B. Øksendal, Optimal switching in an economic activity under uncertainty. SIAM J. Control Optim, (32) (1994), pp. 1021-1036.

[4] M. J. Brennan and E. S. Schwartz, Evaluating natural resource investments, J. Business 58 (1985), pp. 135–137.

[5] J. Cvitanic and I. Karatzas, Backward SDEs with reflection and Dynkin games, Annals of Probability 24 (4) (1996), pp. 2024–2056.

[6] R. Carmona and M. Ludkovski, Pricing asset scheduling flexibility using optimal switching, Appl. Math. Finance, 15 (2008), pp. 405–447.

[7] M. Crandall, H. Ishii, H and P.L. Lions, User's guide to viscosity solutions of second order partial differential equations, Bull. Amer. Math. Soc, 27 (1992), 1–67.

[8] S. J. Deng and Z. Xia, Pricing and Hedging Electric Supply Contracts: A Case with Tolling Agreements, preprint, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, 2005.

[9] A. Dixit, Entry and exit decisions under uncertainty, J. Political Economy, 97 (1989), pp. 620–638.

[10] A. Dixit and R. S. Pindyck, Investment Under Uncertainty, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1994.

[11] B. Djehiche and S. Hamadène, On a finite horizon starting and stopping problem with risk of abandonment, Int. J. Theor. Appl. Finance, 12 (2009), pp. 523–543.

[12] B. Djehiche, S. Hamadène, A. Popier, A finite horizon optimal multiple switching problem, SIAM J. Control Optim. 48 (4) (2009) 2751–2770.

[13] K. Duckworth and M. Zervos, A problem of stochastic impulse control with discretionary stopping, in Proceedings of the 39th IEEE Conference on Decision and Control, IEEE Control Systems Society, Piscataway, NJ, 2000, pp. 222–227.

[14] K. Duckworth and M. Zervos, A model for investment decisions with switching costs, Ann. Appl. Probab, 11 (2001), pp. 239–260.

[15] B. El Asri, Stochastic Optimal Multi-Modes Switching with a Viscosity Solution Approach, Preprint. Available at http://arxiv.org/abs/1102.1256.

[16] B. El Asri, Deterministic minimax impulse control in finite horizon: the viscosity solution approach, to appear in the ESAIM: Control, Optimisation and Calculus of Variations.

[17] B. El Asri and S. Hamadène, The finite horizon optimal multi-modes switching problem: The viscosity solution approach, Appl. Math. Optim, 60 (2009), pp. 213–235.

[18] N. El Karoui, Les aspects probabilistes du contrôle stochastique, in Ecole d'été de Probabilités de Saint-Flour, Lecture Notes in Math. 876, Springer-Verlag, New York, 1980.

[19] N. El Karoui, C. Kapoudjian, E. Pardoux, S. Peng, and M. C. Quenez, Reflected solutions of backward SDEs and related obstacle problems for PDEs, Ann. Probab., 25 (1997), pp. 702–737.

[20] S. Hamadène and M. Jeanblanc, On the starting and stopping problem: Application in reversible investments, Math. Oper. Res., 32 (2007), pp. 182–192.

[21] S. Hamadène and M.A. Morlais, Viscosity Solutions of Systems of PDEs with Interconnected Obstacles and Multi-Modes Switching Problem, preprint.

[22] S. Hamadène and J. Zhang, Switching problem and related system of reflected backward SDEs, Stochastic Processes and their Applications, 120 (2010) 403–426

[23] Y. Hu and S. Tang, Multi-dimensional BSDE with oblique reflection and optimal switching, Probab. Theory Related Fields (2009) doi:10.1007/s00440-009-0202-1.

[24] V. Ly Vath and H. Pham, Explicit solution to an optimal switching problem in the two-regime case, SIAM J. Control Optim., 46 (2007), pp. 395–426.

[25] T. S. Knudsen, B. Meister, and M. Zervos, Valuation of investments in real assets with implications for the stock prices, SIAM J. Control Optim., 36 (1998), pp. 2082–2102.

[26] A. Porchet, N. Touzi, and X. Warin, Valuation of power plants by utility indifference and numerical computation, Math. Methods Oper. Res., 70 (2009), pp. 47–75.

[27] D. Revuz and M. Yor, Continuous Martingales and Brownian Motion, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991.

[28] H. Shirakawa, Evaluation of investment opportunity under entry and exit decisions. *Sūrikaisekikenkyūsho Kōkyūroku* (987) (1997), pp. 107–124.

[29] S. Tang and J. Yong, Finite horizon stochastic optimal switching and impulse controls with a viscosity solution approach, Stoch. Stoch. Rep., 45 (1993), pp. 145–176.

[30] L. Trigeorgis, Real options and interactions with financial flexibility, Financial Management, 22 (1993), pp. 202–224.

[31] L. Trigeorgis, Real Options: Managerial Flexibility and Strategy in Resource Allocation, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1996.

[32] M. Zervos, A problem of sequential entry and exit decisions combined with discretionary stopping, SIAM J. Control Optim., 42 (2003), pp. 397–421.